REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 11, 2006. Claims 1, 2, 13, 20, 24, 28, 29, and 30 have been amended to improve clarity. It is respectfully submitted that none of these claims have been narrowed. Paragraph [0008] of the specification has been amended to correct an obvious error.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected one entry on the Form PTO 1449. A new Form PTO 1449 is submitted herewith along with an additional copy of the reference. The Examiner has also objected to the specification on the grounds that this reference is identified using a hyperlink. The specification has been amended to omit the hyper-link and to provide alternative identification of the NIST Net publication. Withdrawal of the Examiner's objections is therefore requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,862,362 ('362 patent)

Claims 1 and 2 recite:

1. A method for virtually simulating actual networked applications within a network simulation, comprising the steps of:
   initiating a server that interfaces to a network simulator, the server comprising functionality for establishment of a bidirectional mapping of each of one or more application codes to a simulated node or a communication port based on a communication technology;
   initiating one or more client interfaces, the client interfaces being aware of the server;
   providing network application code(s) to make use of the client interfaces, the network application code(s) able to communicate with the server;
   the network simulator being able to interoperate with the server such that the application code's communication appears to originate from a simulated node to which it is mapped; and
   modifying, via the one or more client interfaces and the server, the network application code by removing or inserting messages to or from simulated nodes.

2. A method for virtually simulating actual networked applications within a network simulation, comprising the steps of:

initiating one or more servers to interface to a network simulator;

initiating one or more clients to interface with one or more servers, where the clients are aware of the one or more servers;

bridging application code(s) via use of the client(s) so that the network application code can communicate with the server(s); mapping the application code to a simulated node, communication from the application code now appearing to originate from the simulated node; and

insertion of and extraction of messages or packets from or to application code to simulated node via the one or more clients and servers.

The '362 patent, in contrast, is summarized as follows:

the software test tool and method *simulates a network failure by temporarily redirecting calls intended for actual send and receive handlers in a network operating system to "substitute" handler functions*. These substitute handler functions operate to intercept data being sent to or received from the network. In one embodiment of the invention, the substitute handler then returns a status datum to its caller indicating successful sending or receiving of the data, but does not actually send or receive the data. This effectively cuts off the sending and receiving of data from the network at the substitute handlers. Since no data can be sent or received, the computer is effectively disconnected from the network, as if the network connection were unplugged. The test tool and method resumes network operation by again directing calls to the actual send and receive handler functions.

In alternative embodiments, the substitute handlers can return a status datum to indicate other conditions, such as a network failure. Further, the substitute handlers in some alternative embodiments can intermittently return a status datum indicative of successful sending or receiving, and another status datum indicative of network failure.

Thus, in the '362 patent, there is no "server that interfaces to *a network simulator*, the server comprising functionality for establishment of a bidirectional *mapping of each of one or more application codes to a simulated node* or a communication port based on a communication technology" where "the network simulator being able to interoperate with the server such that the application code's communication *appears to originate from a simulated node* to which it is mapped." It

9

should be noted the above-referenced language requires the mapping of at least one application code to at least one simulated node.

Similarly, the '362 patent fails to disclose the claimed "client interfaces" or the claimed "modifying, via the clients and the server, the network application code by removing or inserting messages to or from simulated nodes."

Rather, as explained in the '362 patent, "[b]y intercepting packets at the NDIS layer, the network failure simulation tool 120 *has a similar effect to that of manually disconnecting the network cable from the computer system 20.*" The '362 patent does not incorporate a "network simulator" which can "interoperate with the server such that the application code's communication *appears to originate from a simulated node* to which it is mapped." The '362 patent simulates a network failure, namely, manually disconnecting a network cable from the computer system.

Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested. As claims 4 and 5 depend from and incorporate the limitations of claim 1, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of these claims is also requested.

Claim 2 recites: "initiating one or more servers to interface to a network simulator", and "bridging application code(s) via use of the client(s) so that the network application code can communicate with the server(s); mapping the application code to a simulated node, communication from the application code now appearing to originate from the simulated node." Thus, at least for the same reasons set forth regarding claim 1, the Examiner's rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn. As claims 15 and 16 depend from and incorporate the limitations of claim 2, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of these claims is also requested

The Examiner has also rejected dependent claims 3, 6-14, and 17-27 as obvious over the '362 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,514 to Liu. Inasmuch as the '514 patent is relied upon by the Examiner solely for allegedly disclosing the additional

limitations of these dependent claims, the addition of the '514 patent cannot cure the deficiencies in the '362 patent identified above. Withdrawal of the Examiners rejection of claims 3, 6-14, and 17-27 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent claim 28 stands rejected as obvious over the ''362 patent in view of the '514 patent. Claim 28, as amended, recites:

> 28. A system for virtually simulating actual networked applications within a network simulation, comprising
> one or more network simulators;
> one or more servers, the servers having functionality for:
> interfacing to one or more network simulators,
> mapping the application code to a simulated node,
> communication from the application code now appearing to originate from the simulated node and
> inserting and extracting messages or packets from an application code,
>
> one or more clients, the clients aware of the server and each having functionality for:
> interfacing with the one or more servers, executing the application code so that the application code can communicate with the server, and
> inserting and extracting of messages or packets from the application code.

For the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, in the '362 patent, there is no network simulator(s), is no "server(s)" which interface to *network simulator(s)*, and no clients which interface with network simulator(s). Further, the '362 patent fails to disclose a server comprising functionality for *mapping the application code to a simulated node,* communication from the application code now appearing to originate from the simulated node"

Withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claim 28, and claims 29 and 30 depending therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:_____

Cary Kappel
Reg. No. 36,561

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940